

The Irish Question Moves Toward Another Climax

IF THE eyes of the world are not fixed on Ireland to-day it is really not Ireland's fault. She has done her best. In ordinary times the crushing victory at the polls of the Irish party, whose candidates were elected on a platform of secession from the British Empire and the wiping out of the historic Irish Nationalist party of Parnell and Redmond, would probably have monopolized the front pages of newspapers printed in the English language from London to San Francisco, from Toronto to Singapore. To-day the announcement that the Sinn Féin leaders are about to declare Ireland an independent republic is received even in New York, the largest Irish city in the world, with the equanimity of newspaper readers, who are accustomed to have served to them, along with their coffee and toast, reports about the collapse of mighty empires and the birth, by the dozen, of new states and nations.

The results of the Irish election, which gave to the Sinn Féin seventy-three of those seats at Westminster, which they, true to their traditional policy, decline to occupy, did not come as a surprise. The outcome was anticipated. Ever since the failure of the government's recruiting policy in Ireland the rapidly advancing conquest of Irish sentiment by the Sinn Féin was the outstanding feature of the situation; and the evident dangers of the administration's half-heartedness caused concern both to Unionists, who called it leniency, and to Home Rulers, who saw in it the abandonment of reiterated pledges to solve the Irish problem according to the desires of the overwhelming majority of the Irish people.

The sweeping victory of Sinn Féin was predicted on the eve of the election by a correspondent in "The New States-

man," the well-informed weekly of the Fabian socialists. After pointing out that the approach of the peace conference gives the separatists the long-yearned-for chance to stage a monster demonstration and to inject the Irish problem into the official inter-Allied negotiation, the article, printed in the December 7 issue of "The New Statesman," says:

"The anti-British state of mind, now so strong in Ireland, finds an outlet in voting Sinn Féin. Moreover, there is a general impression that the possibilities of the Parliamentary Home Rule movement are for the time being exhausted. The movement has lasted over forty years, and Messrs. Dillon and O'Connor are the most venerable politicians in the British Empire. On a liberal estimate the Parliamentarians will retain twenty of the sixty odd seats which were in their possession at the dissolution. Sinn Féin is assured of from sixty to seventy victories; its great strength will lie in the newly enfranchised young men of no property. Mr. T. M. Healy and Mr. William O'Brien, with their followers of the All-for-Ireland League, retire in favor of the Sinn Féiners. Organized labor in the South of Ireland does the same."

The article gives the following summary of the Sinn Féin issue against the Nationalists on the one hand, the British government on the other:

"The principal Sinn Féin 'points' are as follows: (a) That the war has ended with the principle of self-determination being allowed to all the belligerents; (b) that it is more important to save Ireland than to save the remainder of the 'party'; (c) that while Mr. Dillon repudiates a Republic for Ireland, he favors Republicanism elsewhere; (d) that Mr. Dillon appealed for recruits during the war; (e) that the condition to which Ireland has been reduced by the recent declarations of British ministers shows the futility of the Parliamentary policy."

The Nationalists realized the hopelessness of their situation. About half

the number of party members did not seek reelection, so that even before the polls opened the Sinn Féin won twenty-five seats without a contest. The Nationalist leader, Dillon, however, decided to put up a desperate fight on both sides, against the Republicans and the Unionists.

The result of the polling was pretty clear already on the evening of Election Day, December 14. Said an Associated Press dispatch from London:

"Polling in the greater part of Ireland passed quietly except for minor collisions between Sinn Féiners and Nationalists. A close analysis of the voting shows that the Nationalists have been hopelessly beaten by the Sinn Féin, even in places supposed to be Nationalist strongholds."

The final count of the votes on December 28 more than confirmed the triumph of the Separatists. The Associated Press reported:

"The Sinn Féiners, as expected, not only swept Ireland, but gained their seats with enormous majorities, leaving the Nationalist representation in the new Parliament a bare seven members. John Dillon, the Nationalist leader, was defeated by De Valera, Sinn Féiner, for East Mayo, by a majority of 4,000. Joseph Devlin, however, defeated De Valera for the West Belfast seat. De Valera also was a candidate in the South Down constituency."

One of the successful Sinn Féin candidates was a woman, the Countess Markiewicz, one of the leaders of the Easter rebellion in 1916. She won in the St. Patrick division of Dublin, as the only woman returned out of the fourteen female candidates in the United Kingdom. Her election, however, was not expected to change the 100 per cent masculine complexion of the House of Commons. For one thing, as a Sinn Féin member she would have refused to take her seat anyway; moreover, admission would have been denied

to her even had she claimed it. As a London dispatch to "The New York Sun" said:

"LONDON, Jan. 1.—The Countess Markiewicz, the only woman who triumphed in the Parliamentary elections, is ineligible to take her seat, as she is an alien by marriage. The countess, who is a daughter of Sir Henry Gorebooth, married a Polish count, Casimir Dunin de Markiewicz, in 1900. He was never naturalized."

An interesting feature of the election consisted in the fact that about thirty of the returned candidates were—and at the moment of this writing still are—in British prisons. Among them is Professor Edward de Valera, president of the party. Their martyrdom was naturally capitalized by their campaign managers. The Associated Press reported:

"In the election the Sinn Féin leaders made valuable use of the continued imprisonment of their leaders on a charge of complicity in a German plot. Many of the returned Sinn Féin were nominated for Parliament, and the cry of 'Vote for the man unjustly in jail' was raised in their behalf. The Nationalists helped this by repudiating the suggestion of a German plot."

However, "The New York Times" reported on December 31 that the release of the Sinn Féin leaders was decided upon by the British government. One of them, Count Plunkett, who is among the candidates elected, was freed at once.

The plans of the successful Sinn Féiners were watched with keen anxiety in London. There was no doubt whatever that the Sinn Féin members would not, under any circumstances, take their seats in the House of Commons. Their refusal will cost them \$750 apiece, which is the fee deposited by each candidate before polling and which is returned only when a member takes his oath and seat.

The course which the victorious Republicans are expected to adopt was outlined by the London correspondent of "The New York Times" in the following:

"Seventy-three Sinn Féin members will meet in Dublin and constitute themselves a National Assembly. They will appoint a President and proclaim the independence of the Irish Republic. The National Assembly will begin to legislate at once and issue a proclamation."

"An attempt will be made to levy taxes, and all attempts to collect imperial revenue will be resisted. Missions will be sent to foreign countries and the actions of an independent state will be imitated in every possible way."

"Of course, this means inevitable collision with the large British force now in Ireland. This is exactly what the Sinn Féin are praying for. They are prepared for considerable sacrifice of life so long as fighting can take place when Allied conferences and the peace congress are being held."

"They will endeavor to send a mission to both these gatherings and will demand admission as an independent state fighting for the right of self-determination against British tyranny."

But the Sinn Féin leaders will apparently not restrict themselves to demonstrations. Preparations for armed resistance to the British are reported by "The New York Times":

"It seems certain that the Sinn Féin has procured arms and ammunition in large quantities, although the source of these supplies is a mystery. Raids carried out by the government have discovered some of these hoards, but there are others left as yet untouched."

So far the English newspapers have observed a rather restrained attitude in commenting upon the Irish developments. While they exhibit a tendency

not to take the Sinn Féin victory too seriously, there is unmistakably a subdued feeling of alarm as to what will happen if the extremists insist on living up to their threats and attempt to put over their plans to declare Irish independence without delay. "The Sunday Times" of London writes:

"Ireland has not disappointed, because the result was a foregone conclusion. Sinn Féin has thrown down the challenge to ordered government, and it cannot be ignored."

"The Observer" is more outspoken. It says:

"Sinn Féiners, whose pro-Germanism reeked no doom for the liberty of other nations, if only their own impossible purposes might be served, have torn Ireland asunder, as she was never torn, and made wider, almost beyond healing in our time, the division between the Unionist North and the rest."

According to "The Morning Post," of London, the responsibility for Sinn Féin victory belongs on the shoulders of the British government. The paper says editorially:

"If the opportunities of this war had been in the hands of real statesmen Ireland might by now have been as well affected as any part of the United Kingdom."

The Dublin correspondent of "The London Daily News" discusses in detail the plans of the Sinn Féin leaders. "Ireland has voted herself out of the British Parliament," he writes, and predicts that the seventy-three Sinn Féin leaders will constitute themselves into a National Council at Dublin. Then he says:

"As far as I can ascertain, the business of the council will be to draft a scheme for the establishment of a sovereign Irish state, and appoint delegates to present this scheme to the peace conference."

"As to what will happen if the peace conference refuses to admit the Irish delegates, I can only quote Harry Boland, Sinn Féin M. P. for South Roscommon, who said yesterday: 'If the conference fails us we will put forth such organization in Ireland as will make it clear there can be no peace in Western Europe as long as Ireland remains under the heel of the English oppressor.'"

"The weapons of general strike, of sabotage, of civil disturbances with attacks upon property and wholesale passive resistance to the collection of taxes, are all hinted at."

"Threats like these may sound foolish in London, but in Dublin it is impossible not to admit the great mass of the people are terribly in earnest."

That the Irish question will be brought up in the peace conference is the opinion, among others.

That an attempt will be made to enlist President Wilson's support for the cause of Irish independence, was foreshadowed by an Associated Press report from Dublin, according to which December 22 was celebrated as Wilson Day throughout Ireland. The dispatch said:

"Meetings were held in more than forty towns and resolutions drafted by the Sinn Féiners inviting President Wilson to visit Ireland and pledging to him Ireland's support were adopted. At most of the meetings Constitutional Nationalists joined with the Sinn Féiners."

"The attitude of the Unionists is that the President will not interfere in the domestic politics of Ireland, but that he would be welcomed to examine into real conditions and problems."

The London correspondent of "The New York World" believes that President Wilson has already brought up the problem of Ireland in his first conference with Lloyd George and Balfour. He adds, however, that there is no positive information to this effect.

Bitter Wars Are Still Being Fought on European Fields

THERE are still wars fighting in Europe. Poland is conducting what the Polish Agency at Lausanne describes in "The Tribune" as "a tarring raid into Germany," with the aim set at nothing less than Berlin; Bolshevik troops are also reported as marching toward the German line and American troops marked the last day of 1918 by smashing into the Bolshevik lines and recapturing the village of Kadish, on the Arctic front. A dispatch from Northern Russia to "The Chicago Tribune" declares that American soldiers in Russia are somewhat puzzled as to the job they were sent to do. The correspondent goes on to say:

"As civilians back home they took an interest in politics, and now as citizen soldiers fighting in a foreign land they want a clear understanding of the government's reasons and future policies. They say that mistakes of policy and judgment have been made in the past by the expedition. The humblest private will tell you that so far as Northern Russia is concerned a boy was sent to do a man's job."

"From the motive of protecting the war materials in these northern lands so that they will not fall into German hands and making it impossible to found German submarine bases, the expedition has developed into one of fighting on the Russian front to aid the Allied cause."

"It was thought that, with a small Allied army here as a nucleus, which actually is neither active nor large enough, the Russians would flock to our standards and develop a strong army over night. There were some peasant volunteers, but the results have been far from satisfactory. So today the Allied forces find themselves handicapped by a lack of men, with a vastly larger but potentially much inferior enemy force facing them."

"The Allied forces have not even been strong enough nor has their policy been sufficiently clear to convince fully the population here that they will not have to fear the return of the Bolsheviks. With proper faith in the future policy of the Allies, it is quite possible that thousands of Russians might join the fighting ranks, but up to the present time practically all the fighting has been done by the Americans and their allies."

"Our soldiers know this far better than the people of America can possibly have known it. They have great faith in President Wilson and patiently await the action of the Paris conference."

An Associated Press communication from Warsaw, printed in the "New York Times," outlines a new military line established by the Polish government on its Eastern front. The line extends from Lapy, in the north, southward to Litry and beyond Lemberg. The article states that thousands of refugees con-

tinued to arrive in Poland from Moscow and other points in Central Russia and the Ukraine. Desultory fighting is reported at Lemberg between the Ukrainians and the Poles. The Associated Press also reported thirteen hours of street fighting in Odessa between Russian volunteers and the Russian Republican army. The fighting ceased finally with French reserves assisting the volunteers.

Gertrude Atherton writes in the "New York Times" from Paris that the Polish question is the most significant of all the problems before the peace conference so far as the peace and well being of Russia is concerned. The writer goes on:

"American sympathy for Poland has been largely sentimental. Once a great and powerful nation, she was bitterly wronged by the partition, and during the recent war was devastated more thoroughly by the Germans than France or Belgium. The cloak of Paderewski opened many purses in the United States and inspired still more good wishes for the union of the three several parts of the ancient kingdom. So far so good; and no doubt the great nations will keep their pledges to restore to the smaller and long-oppressed races their ancient rights."

"But that is a question for to-morrow, and the Polish question of the day—the moment—is acute."

"If it is treated with indifference, chaos may result in a large part of Europe. A Bolshevik army is on its eastern border. The German eastern army, under Hoffman, whose numbers are estimated at from 400,000 to 600,000, is in the northeast and is either sympathetic with the Bolsheviks or using them for its own nefarious purposes."

"General Pilsudski has a small loyal army in Poland, but few arms and little ammunition, and his men even lack shoes. General Haller, head of the Polish army in France, is hoping from day to day to be permitted to take his 30,000 men to Poland; and, although there may be natural rivalry between the two generals, they are agreed on one point—they cannot stem the Bolshevik tide without Allied help."

The New York "World" correspondent in Washington writes that the Allies have no favor for the Polish invasion of Germany. He says that the State Department advises minimize the clashes between Poles and Germans and make them out to be more in the nature of riots than battles.

"The best informed opinion in Washington is that Polish leaders will not be permitted to define the territorial borders of the new Poland. These will be fixed by the peace council."

"It is believed, however, that the Allied will furnish to Poland the necessary munitions for protection against threatened Bolshevik aggressions. Such munitions will be furnished only with the understanding that they are not to be used for offensive action against the Central Empires."

"Indeed, the Allies and America are under moral obligations to protect the Central Powers against outside aggression, since they have laid down their arms and submitted to armistice terms dictated by the Allies and the United States."

English Politicians Who Went Down on the Asquith Ship

PERHAPS the most spectacular result of the recent British elections is the total disappearance from Parliament of two important and picturesque groups of politicians, the inner circle of Asquith Liberals and the pacifist Laborites.

The débacle suffered by the bodyguard of Asquith since the death of Campbell-Bannerman, leader of the great Liberal party, is unprecedented in the history of British elections. Not one of the friends and lieutenants of the former Premier was endorsed by his constituents.

The captain, Henry Herbert Asquith, went down with the ship. He will not resume his seat in the House of Commons, of which he was a member since 1886. In that year the young lawyer was returned by the voters of East Fife on a platform supporting Gladstone and Home Rule. Ever since his college days Asquith belonged to the advanced—or, as it would be called to-day, left—wing of the Liberal party. He started out as an ardent anti-imperialist, a "Little Englander," an advocate of social reform, a Home Ruler—in a word, a Radical. He was first appointed to a Cabinet post, that of Home Secretary, by Gladstone, who regarded him as one of his ablest lieutenants. After the resignation of Lord Rosebery, Sir Henry

Campbell-Bannerman became leader of the Liberal party, and when the latter was appointed Premier he named Asquith to the supremely important post of Chancellor of the Exchequer. By this time his radical tendencies had worn off to a large extent.

His zeal for Home Rule, however, continued unabated, and he also made himself conspicuous as one of the most relentless opponents of the tariff reform movement instigated by Joseph Chamberlain. He was an advocate of good relations with America, and supported efforts to establish good relations between Britain and Russia. He became Prime Minister in 1908, after the death of Campbell-Bannerman, and retained the post till 1916, when one of his lieutenants, David Lloyd George, succeeded him. But this is already recent history.

Walter Runciman, another defeated Liberal, was appointed president of the Board of Trade (corresponding to our Secretary of Commerce), in 1914, when, on the declaration of war with Germany, John Burns resigned from the Asquith Cabinet. He is a wealthy shipowner, of Scotch descent, and entered political life in 1899 by defeating, at Oldham, his friend Winston Churchill, then a Conservative.

Charles F. G. Masterman successively held several posts in the Asquith gov-

ernment. He was promoted from Parliamentary Secretary of the Home Office to Financial Secretary to the Treasury in 1912, and later to Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster. His present defeat at the polls is not his first experience of the kind. He was beaten at the polls in 1911 and 1912, and finally the Liberals had to find an "easy" constituency to secure for him a seat in Parliament.

Reginald McKenna's defeat eliminates one of the most conspicuous members from Parliament. He was first returned by Monmouthshire in 1895. In 1905 he became Financial Secretary to the Treasury, in 1907 president of the Board of Education, in 1911 Home Secretary, in 1915 Chancellor of the Exchequer, which post he held until the downfall of Asquith. He was one of the ministers who were roughly handled by the militant suffragists in 1913, who even planned to kidnap him for his stout resistance to the suffrage demands.

Sir John Simon is one of the leading British lawyers, with an income reputed to exceed \$150,000 a year. He was always a loyal Asquithian. At the outbreak of the war he resigned, but was induced by his chief's urgings to retain his post as Attorney General. He was a strong opponent of conscription, and during the last year was classed almost as a pacifist.

Europe's Preliminary Gestures Before Settling the Peace

(Continued From Page One)

ment at the beginning of the war, on account of their extreme pacifism.

Arthur Henderson, the Labor leader and former member of the government who turned pacifist, was badly defeated and Labor in general fared badly. It had been conceded that Labor would get 100 seats, but they only succeeded in winning seventy-six, of whom ten are Coalitionists. This is, however, a larger representation than they had in the old Parliament, where they numbered thirty-eight. Among the Labor members elected was Havelock Wilson, leader of the Seamen's Union, and Ben Tillett, leader of the dock workers. Tillett is expected to lead the Labor party in the House.

Another surprise was in the defeat of all the women candidates, with the exception of the Countess Markiewicz, the Sinn Féin leader, and a special cable to "The Sun" says she will not be allowed to take her seat, as she is an alien, having married a Pole who has never been naturalized.

Until the last moment it was thought that Christabel Pankhurst had been elected, but the final returns showed her defeat by the narrow margin of 775 votes by a Labor candidate. Other women candidates who failed of election were Miss Violet Markham, Mrs. Charlotte Despard, sister of Field Marshal Viscount French, Mrs. Fethick Lawrence, Mrs. Oliver Strachey and Miss Mary MacArthur.

The vote was extremely light, only about one-half the registered voters going to the polls. This is partly accounted for by the absence of so many men with the armies, but the chief reason was the indifference of the electorate,

the Coalition victory being a foregone conclusion. Several millions of women were added to the register and there was considerable anxiety as to the effect of their votes. It was thought in some quarters they would surely elect the women candidates, and in the hectic moments of the first receipt of the returns the defeat of the women was laid to lack of time to organize their vote. Calmer thought, however, decided that, once having won the franchise, women vote by principle and not by sex.

Essentially, the result was a great personal triumph for Lloyd George as the "Victory Premier." But it was an exceedingly well organized triumph with little room left for defeat. Four hundred and seventy-three of the victorious candidates went to the polls as the official representatives of the government that won the war. Forty-six others were pledged to support a victorious Coalition. The Coalition programme comprised five exceedingly simple points:

1. Punish the Kaiser.
2. Make Germany pay.
3. Get the soldier home as soon as possible.
4. Fair treatment for the returned soldier and sailor.
5. Better housing and better social conditions.

On the surface of the results the Unionists are back in power for the first time since they had to give way to the Liberals during the South African War. In the new House Lloyd George's majority will be made up of 336 Coalition Unionists, 127 Coalition Liberals, 10 Coalition Labor and 46 straight Unionists. The old Liberal party has practically ceased to exist, but while Lloyd George had to make many concessions to the Unionists for the sake of the election, it is expected that they will have to

follow him into strange ways, if the Coalition pledge is kept and he is retained in power. The prophecies are that the present alignment will not endure for any great length of time, but that the hide-bound reactionaries of the Coalition will soon again be found in the Unionist fold, while from among the others will be born a new party under the leadership of Lloyd George. The question is whether the Lloyd George party will command a clear majority of the new House or whether there will have to be another election. The Northcliffe press anticipates a new election in a very short time.

"The London Sunday Observer," J. L. Garvin's paper, said of the election:

"Lloyd George has gained a personal triumph which is quite without any parallel in our records. Above all, the pacifists are annihilated everywhere. And not only that. All who were suspected of semi-pacifism, or of the faintest tincture of it, or of weakness in any phase of the struggle, or of feeble inclination to parley with the enemy when the fight was at its darkest and grimest have been cast out. If no man could have greater fortune than Mr. Lloyd George has at this moment, no man could bear greater responsibility, nor one of a more definite kind."

"The London Sunday Times" said:

"It is not the Premier alone who stands or falls by the work of the new Parliament; the governing classes are equally on their trial. Men of all parties have come back from the constituencies with a report of new and rapidly growing impatience, not confined to any one class of the political game, as it has hitherto been played. If the governing classes are wise, they will recognize they have now what may be a final opportunity to justify their traditional place in the political system by their light and leading, and that they cannot do this better than in furthering to their utmost, even at the cost of their own class, the privileged programme of social reconstruction."

tion that the Prime Minister has laid before the electorate."

American opinion received the result as a personal triumph for Lloyd George and a victory for undiluted patriotism. The Tribune said:

"It is in large measure a victory vote, unquestionably. It is in large measure, also, a vote of confidence in a great personality—one of the few really great men that the war has produced. The platform of the Coalition was essentially Mr. Lloyd George, his views and his ability. That was the weakness of the Coalition appeal, said its critics, who pointed to the definite programme of the Labor party in contrast. Its weakness has proved its strength. Not even the defection of Lord Northcliffe could weaken the support of the British people for their war Premier. Mr. Lloyd George made his stand clear for a victory of justice, with preparation and sure barriers against another eruption of the Hun. Those Liberals like Mr. Asquith, who while professing agreement to such general demands revealed a less stern attitude toward Germany, raised a clear-cut issue that the voters of England could not ignore."

"The Providence Journal" stressed the patriotic motive. It said:

"The result is a triumph not for Mr. Lloyd George only, but in general for that brand of patriotism that has stood for one hundred per cent prosecution of the world struggle against Germany. It is a rebuke to lukewarmness and doubting. It is a plain warning to those theorists who would put some other consideration above undivided love of country in the time of peril."

"The Boston Evening Transcript" sees in the triumph of Lloyd George a beacon for the world. It says:

"The result is a heartening one for supporters of the world-redeeming and world-steadying forces of the Entente, in every country. It dispels the fear of disorganization. It holds Germany to the duty of compensation and full reparation. It puts

an end to British, Irish, French and American Bolshevism, and portends the overthrow and destruction of German and Russian anarchy and anarchism. Lloyd George, already at the head of European statesmen in influence, is promoted by the result of the British election to a position still greater personal and political strength and advantage. It puts in his hands a tremendous responsibility. He becomes the chief organizer of the work of restoring the sapped and white-bled nations to vigor and strength. He is not merely the 'pillar of a nation's hope,' but the 'centre of a world's desire.'"

Secretary Daniels Throws a Depth Bomb in a Big Navy Declaration

SECRETARY DANIELS' raised a storm of protest in Washington by the three-year building programme for the navy that he laid before the House Naval Affairs Committee. This programme, according to "The New York Times"—

"calls for the building of ten first class battleships, six battle-cruisers, ten scout cruisers and 130 small craft. It is estimated that such a programme would place the United States on the same relative footing with Great Britain, giving this country, with the vessels now building, sixty-two first class battleships, while England has sixty-one at present in commission."

"Mr. Daniels explained that the new three-year programme which President Wilson, he, and the General Board of the navy wished Congress to adopt this session was approved by the President after the signing of the armistice.

In the world which would so strengthen this country's position in the peace conference, said Mr. Daniels, 'as to authorize this enlarged naval programme. Before I wrote my annual report I took up the matter of a big building programme with the President, and then, later, after the armistice was signed, I spoke to him again on this subject. He very earnestly urged that this programme be adopted. Nothing would so aid him in the peace conference as Congress's authorization of a big navy.'"

It was this feature of Secretary Daniels' statement that brought forth the protest in Congress. The Tribune's Washington correspondence said:

"Men who have been advocating a larger navy for decades—who forced an increase of preparedness at a time, just after the outbreak of the European war, when President Wilson and the Administration generally, including Southern Democratic leaders in Congress, were laughing at the preparedness agitation as hysteria—have no sympathy with this gesture at this time."

"There is no belief, even among the friends of the Administration, that the 'bluff,' as it is freely characterized by its critics, will have much effect."

Enlarging upon the needs for a great American navy, Secretary Daniels told the House Naval Affairs Committee:

"It is my firm conviction that if the Conference at Versailles does not result in a general agreement to put an end to naval building on the part of all nations, then the United States must bend her will and bend her energies, must give her men and give her money to the task of the creation of incomparably the greatest navy in the world."

"She has no designs upon the territory, or the trade, of any other nation, or group of nations. But she is pledged to the support of the Monroe Doctrine. She is pledged to the support of the weak, wherever they may suffer threats. She is incomparably rich, incomparably strong in natural resources. If need be, she must be incomparably strong in defence against aggressors and in defence against evil-doers."

comparably strong in defence against aggressors and in defence against evil-doers."

Foreseeing, however, that the peace conference might result in the formation of a league of nations and a measure of general disarmament—

"Mr. Daniels proposes that the bill should contain the following provision:

"If at any time before the construction authorized by this act shall have been established, with the cooperation of the United States of America, an international tribunal or tribunals, competent to secure peaceful determinations of all international disputes, and which shall render unnecessary the maintenance of competitive armaments, then, and in that case, such naval expansions as may be inconsistent with the engagements made in the establishment of such tribunal or tribunals may be suspended, when so ordered by the President of the United States."

"The Times" report of the hearing before the committee said:

"How will you settle how large our navy shall be, if a league of nations is created?" asked Representative Butler of Pennsylvania.

"We ought to contribute in units, power and men just as much as any other nation, and not allow any other nation to have more power than we have," replied Mr. Daniels.

"Do you think there is great diplomatic advantage to the United States in being able to say to England that it must agree to a limitation of armaments, or the United States will build a navy able to whip the British navy?" Representative Kelley demanded.

"I have great faith that when the peace conference adjourns there will be an agreement to limit armaments," Mr. Daniels responded. "If there is no agreement, then we must build the ships so as to have such a powerful navy that it would make any nation in the world think several times before venturing to attack us."